Remarks/Arguments:

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed April 14, 2008.

Claims 1, 3-16, 18-30, 32-44, and 46-49 were pending in the Application prior to the outstanding Office Action. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-16, 18-30, 32-44, and 46-49. The present Response amends claims 1, 16, 30 and 46, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration claims 1, 3-16, 18-30, 32-44, and 46-49. Reconsideration of the rejections is requested.

A. Claim rejections – 35 USC § 112

Claims 1, 3-16, 18-30, and 32-44 are rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as invention. Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1, 16 and 30 conforms to the statutory requirement under 35 USC §112, and reconsideration of the rejection is requested

B. Claim rejections – 35 USC § 102

Claims 1, 3-13, 15-16, 18-27, 29-30, 32-42, 44, and 46-49 are rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Anuff et al, U.S. Patent No. 6,327,628.

Here, independent claim 1 is amended to include the statement of "*wherein the control tree is a logical representation of a control taxonomy that is associated with a graphical user interface (GUI), wherein the control tree includes a set of controls which represent corresponding graphical and functional elements in web applications and are related hierarchically to one another including at least one portlet control that represents at least one portlet.*"

Applicant respectfully submits that Anuff discloses the back end processing components/objects implementing the requested GUI. However, such back end processing components/objects implements or create but do **not** represent and correspond to graphical and functional elements in web applications that is associated with a control taxonomy. Therefore, the interrelationship among all relevant back end processing components/objects cannot anticipate or render obvious the control tree in present invention as embodied in Claim 1.

Furthermore, the servers 12a-12n in Anuff et al. are the creator or implementer of GUI not the "factory" to generate control tree, which includes a set of controls and is a representation of a control taxonomy that is associated with a GUI.

In addition, a lifecycle stage that involves a control or control tree such as "init" that allows a control to perform initialization can not be anticipated or rendered obvious by a constructor in OOP that instantiates a real object, since the "init" lifecycle stage involves a control or control tree.

Hence, Anuff, et al. fails to anticipate the present invention as embodied in claim 1. Therefore, independent claim 1 should be in allowable condition. Subsequently, dependent claims 3-13 and 15 which are based on allowable independent claim 1 should all be in allowable condition.

Furthermore, independent claims 16, 30 and 46 are amended in the same fashion as claim 1. Therefore, independent claim 16 and 30 are both in allowable condition at least for the same reason as stated above. Subsequently, dependent claims 18-27 and 29 which are based on allowable independent claim 16; dependent claims 32-42 and 44 which are based on allowable independent claim 30; and dependent claims 47-49 which are based on allowable independent claim 46 should all be in allowable condition.

C. Claim rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claims 14, 28, and 43 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anuff.

Here, dependent claim 14 which is based on allowable independent claim 1; dependent claim 28 which is based on allowable independent claim 16; and dependent claim 43 which is based on allowable independent claim 30 should all be in allowable condition.

D. Conclusion

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and a Notice of Allowance is requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: __June 13, 2008__   By: ___/Kuiran (Ted) Liu/_____
                                                      Kuiran (Ted) Liu
                                                      Reg. No. 60,039

Cutomer No.: 23910
FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, 14th Floor
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800